

REMARKS

Claims 51-77 are pending in this application. Claims 1-50 have been previously cancelled. Claims 51-58, and claims 64-77 were rejected. Claims 59-63 were indicated as being allowable.

The Examiner objected to the claims for incorrect numbering. The claims are herein submitted with the correct numbering.

Claim 64 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis of the phrase "a context relevant hierarchy."

Claims 51-58, 64-66, 68-71, and 75-77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bharat; claims 67 and 72-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bharat.

The Examiner indicated that claims 59-63 were allowable, and further indicated that the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest *"evaluating with the personalized relevance interface application a content indicia of the particular object accessed and automatically retrieving an additional set of objects from the object space, each retrieved object associated with the content indicia"* as recited in claim 59. While Applicants do not agree that Bharat discloses or suggests the subject matter of claims 51-58 and 64-77, in the interests of advancing prosecution, the other independent claims 51, 64, and 70 have been amended to recite limitations consistent with the above limitation of claim 59. Accordingly, all claims should now be allowable.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' representative at (415) 875-2410.

Respectfully submitted,
DONALD R. TURNBALL
HINRICH SCHUETZE

Dated: April 10, 2006

By: 

Robert R. Sachs
Reg. No.: 42,120
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2410

BEST AVAILABLE COPY